

AD-A032 909

COLORADO STATE UNIV FORT COLLINS DEPT OF MATHEMATICS F/G 12/1
APPROXIMATION WITH RECIPROCAL OF POLYNOMIALS ON COMPACT SETS.(U)
AUG 76 D J LEEMING, G D TAYLOR AF-AFOSR-2878-76

UNCLASSIFIED

AFOSR-TR-76-1164

NL

1 of 1
ADA032909



END

DATE
FILMED

1 - 77

ADA 032909

3

1

AFOSR - TR - 76 - 1164

APPROXIMATION WITH RECIPROCAL

OF POLYNOMIALS ON COMPACT SETS^{*†}

D. J. Leeming¹ and G. D. Taylor²

1. University of Victoria, Victoria, B. C., Canada, V8W 2Y2.
2. Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, 80523.



Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.


*Supported in part by National Research Council of Canada grant A8061.

†Supported in part by AFOSR-76-2878.

APPROXIMATION WITH RECIPROCAL OF POLYNOMIALS

2

Proofs go to: Prof. G. D. Taylor,
Department of Mathematics,
Colorado State University,
Fort Collins, Colorado, 80523.

ACQUISITION 101		
NTIS	WILLIAMSON <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
DOC	FOR CLERK <input type="checkbox"/>	
UNCLASSIFIED	<input type="checkbox"/>	
JUSTIFICATION		
BY		
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES		
Dist.	Avail. Code	SPECIAL
		

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

19 REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM	
18 1. REPORT NUMBER AFOSR - TR - 76 - 1164	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) APPROXIMATION WITH RECIPROCAL OF POLYNOMIALS ON COMPACT SETS.		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED 9 Interim rept.	
7. AUTHOR(s) 10 D. J. Leeming and G. D. Taylor		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) 13 AF-AFOSR - 2878-76	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Colorado State University Department of Mathematics Fort Collins, CO 80523		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 61102F / 9749-23	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS AFOSR/NM Bldg. 410, Bolling AFB Washington, D.C. 20332		12. REPORT DATE 11 August 1976	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) 12 24p.		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 23	
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED	
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release: distribution unlimited.			
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)			
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Rational approximation on compact sets			
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) A theory best uniform approximation by reciprocals of polynomials on compact sets is developed. In particular an existence theorem is shown to hold in this case.			

1. INTRODUCTION

Let X be a compact subset of the real line and denote by $C(X)$ the class of all real valued continuous functions defined on X . Norm $C(X)$ with the uniform norm, i.e. for all $f \in C(X)$, $\|f\| = \max\{|f(x)| : x \in X\}$. Let n be a positive integer and set $R_n^0(X) = \{1/p : p \in \Pi_n, p(x) > 0, \forall x \in X\}$ where Π_n denotes the set of all real algebraic polynomials of degree $\leq n$. Note that $R_n^0(X)$ consists of the positive elements of the ~~usual~~ ^{usually} set denoted by $R_n^0(X)$.

In this paper, we shall study the problem of approximation of positive functions in $C(X)$ by elements of $R_n^0(X)$. The emphasis of this study is as follows. First, we wish to contrast this setting with that of approximation by elements of $R_n^m(X)$, $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 1$, in $C(X)$. Basically, there is one major difference, namely that existence holds for this case; whereas, this is not true for $R_n^m(X)$, $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 1$ and X not an interval. In addition, when X is not an interval the proof of existence is very long and tedious. Next, we shall observe that the usual characterization (alternation) and uniqueness results hold for this problem using the standard arguments. Finally, we shall discuss the computation of best approximations from $R_n^0(X)$.

These results will be used in a forthcoming paper on uniform approximation on $[0, \infty)$ with reciprocals of polynomials. See ([2], [3], [4], [8], [14] and [18]) for various recent studies concerning certain aspects of this problem. Since we are interested in applying these results to this setting, we shall approximate $1/f$ in what follows.

2. EXISTENCE

As noted in the introduction, it is well known that best rational approximants from $R_n^m(X)$, $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 1$ and X not an interval need not exist. Indeed, let X be a finite subset of $[0,1]$, such that $0 \in X$ and $\text{card}(X) \geq n + m + 2$. Define $f \in C(X) \sim R_n^m(X)$ by $f(0) = 1$ and $f(x) = 2$ for $x \in X \sim \{0\}$. Let $r_k(x)$ be defined by $r_k(x) = \frac{2kx+1}{kx+1}$. Then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f - r_k\| = 0$ showing that no best approximation exists for f from $R_n^m(X)$.

In what follows, let n be a nonnegative integer and let X be a compact subset of $[0,B]$, $B > 0$ with $\text{card}(X) \geq n + 2$. Set $K = \{p \in \Pi_n : p(x) > 0, \forall x \in X\}$, let $f \in C(X)$, $f \notin K$ with $f(x) > 0$ for all $x \in X$ and set $\Delta = \inf\{\|\frac{1}{f} - \frac{1}{p}\| : p \in K\}$. We have the following lemma.

LEMMA 1. Let X, f, Δ be as defined above. Then $\Delta > 0$.

Proof. Suppose $\Delta = 0$. Then, setting $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{c}{q}$, c a constant, $q \in K$, $\|q\| = 1$, there is a sequence of polynomials $\{q_n\} \subset K$ such that $1 \geq \|\frac{1}{f} - \frac{c_n}{q_n}\| \rightarrow 0$. Since $|c_n| \leq 1 + \frac{1}{m}$, $m = \min\{|f(x)| : x \in X\}$, we may assume that $c_n \rightarrow c^* \geq 0$ and $q_n \rightarrow q^*$ uniformly, with $q^* \in \Pi_n$ and $\|q^*\| = 1$. We claim that $c^* > 0$. Suppose $c^* = 0$, and let

$x \in X$ be such that $q^*(x) > 0$ (such an x exists since $q^* \neq 0$ and $\text{card}(X) \geq n+2$). Then we have

$$0 < \frac{1}{f(x)} = \frac{1}{f(x)} - \frac{0}{q^*(x)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{f(x)} - \frac{c_n}{q_n(x)} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{f} - \frac{c_n}{q_n} \right| = 0 \text{ which}$$

is a contradiction. Hence $c^* > 0$. Since $\left| \frac{c_n}{q_n} \right| \leq 1 + \left| \frac{1}{f} \right|$ we have

that $q^*(x) > 0$ for all $x \in X$. Thus $\frac{c_n}{q_n} \rightarrow \frac{c^*}{q^*} \in K$ uniformly and

$$\left| \frac{1}{f} - \frac{c^*}{q^*} \right| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{f} - \frac{c_n}{q_n} \right| = 0, \text{ hence } f = \frac{c^*}{q^*} \in K, \text{ which is a contra-}$$

diction. Therefore $\Delta > 0$.

THEOREM 1. Let n be a nonnegative integer and let X, K, f and Δ be defined as above. Then there exists a $p^* \in K$ such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{f} - \frac{1}{p^*} \right| = \Delta.$$

Proof. Since X is compact, $f > 0$ on X , there exist positive

constants m, M such that $m \leq \frac{1}{f(x)} \leq M$ for all $x \in X$. For $p \in K$

we write $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{c}{q}$ where $q(x) > 0$ for all $x \in X$, $c > 0$ and $\|q\| = 1$.

Then, as in Lemma 1, there exist sequences $\{c_n\}, \{q_n\}$ such that $c_n > 0$

for all n , $q_n(x) > 0$ for all $x \in X$ with $\|q_n\| = 1$ satisfying

$$i) \quad 1 + \Delta \geq \left| \frac{1}{f} - \frac{c_n}{q_n} \right|$$

$$ii) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{f} - \frac{c_n}{q_n} \right| = \Delta$$

$$iii) \quad |c_n| \leq 1 + \Delta + M.$$

v, quick nu

By extracting subsequences $\{c_{n_k}\}$ and $\{q_{n_v}\}$ of $\{c_n\}$ and $\{q_n\}$ respectively, there exists $c^* \geq 0$ and $q^* \in \Pi_n$ with $q^*(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in X$ and $\|q^*\| = 1$ such that $c_{n_k} \rightarrow c^*$ and $q_{n_v}(x) \rightarrow q^*(x)$ uniformly in X .

We now claim that $c^* > 0$. Indeed, suppose $c^* = 0$ and let $Z = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \subset X$, $k \leq n$, be all the zeros of q^* contained in X . Now, if $Z = \emptyset$, then $q^*(x) > 0$ for all $x \in X$ holds and we have for each $x \in X$

$$\frac{1}{f(x)} = \frac{1}{f(x)} - \frac{0}{q^*(x)} = \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{f(x)} - \frac{c_{n_v}}{q_{n_v}(x)} \leq \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{f} - \frac{c_{n_v}}{q_{n_v}} \right| = \Delta. \quad (1)$$

Thus, taking $\tilde{p} = \frac{2}{\Delta}$, the inequality

$$\left| \frac{1}{f(x)} - \frac{1}{\tilde{p}(x)} \right| = \left| \frac{1}{f(x)} - \frac{\Delta}{2} \right| \leq \frac{\Delta}{2} \text{ holds for each } x \in X. \text{ Since } \tilde{p} \in K,$$

this contradicts our assumption that $\inf_{p \in \Pi_n} \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{f} - \frac{1}{p} \right| : p \in K \right\} = \Delta > 0$.

Therefore, we assume that $Z \neq \emptyset$. Partition Z into two subsets

$Z = I \cup J$ where $I = \{x \in Z: x \text{ is an isolated point of } X\}$, and $J = Z \sim I$. Now, for $x \in X \sim Z$ we have that $q^*(x) > 0$ so $\frac{1}{f(x)} \leq \Delta$ holds by (1). Also, since $f \in C(X)$ and $y \in J$ implies that y is a limit point of $X \sim Z$ we have, by continuity, that $\frac{1}{f(y)} \leq \Delta$ holds.

Now, if $I = \emptyset$, then our argument for the case $Z = \emptyset$ yields our desired contradiction. Hence, let us assume that

$I = \{y_1 < y_2 < \dots < y_\mu\}$, $\mu \geq 1$. Now, let $a < b$ be such that $X \subset (a, b)$.

Construct open intervals (α_v, β_v) as follows (observing that $X \sim I$ is a compact subset of X): set $\alpha_1 = \max\{a, \max\{x: x \in X \sim I \text{ and } x < y_1\}\}$ and $\beta_1 = \min\{b, \min\{x: x \in X \sim I \text{ and } x > y_1\}\}$. If $\beta_1 > y_\mu$ stop this process with the interval (α_1, β_1) . If $\beta_1 < y_\mu$, then there exists an integer i_1 , $1 \leq i_1 \leq \mu-1$ such that $y_{i_1} < \beta_1 < y_{i_1+1}$. In this case,

set $\alpha_2 = \max\{x: x \in X \sim I \text{ and } x < y_{i_1+1}\}$ and

$\beta_2 = \min\{b, \min\{x: x \in X \sim I \text{ and } x > y_{i_1+1}\}\}$. Note that we must

have $\alpha_2 \geq \beta_1$ as $\beta_1 \in X \sim I$ and $\beta_1 < y_{i_1+1}$. Once again, if $\beta_2 > y_\mu$,

stop this process. If $\beta_2 < y_\mu$, we continue and, since μ is finite, this construction must end after, say $v \leq \mu$ steps, giving v pairwise disjoint open intervals $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), \dots, (\alpha_v, \beta_v)$ where

$a \leq \alpha_1 < \beta_1 \leq \alpha_2 < \beta_2 \leq \dots \leq \alpha_v < \beta_v \leq b$, $(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \cap I \neq \emptyset$ and

$(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \cap (X \sim I) = \emptyset$ for $i = 1, \dots, v$. For convenience, let us assume

that $(\alpha_r, \beta_r) \cap I = \{y_{i_{r-1}+1}, \dots, y_{i_r}\}$ for $r = 1, \dots, v$ with $i_0 = 0$.

Now we will construct a new set of points I' where $I' \cap X = \emptyset$ as follows: if (α_r, β_r) is such that $a < \alpha_r, \beta_r < b$ and

$(\alpha_r, \beta_r) \cap I = \{y_{i_{r-1}+1}, \dots, y_{i_r}\}$ consists of an odd number of points,

then set $y'_{i_r} = \frac{1}{2}(\beta_r + y_{i_r})$ and require that $y'_{i_r} \in I'$. Therefore, I'

can consist of at most v points. For convenience, set

$I' = \{y'_1, \dots, y'_\gamma\}$, $\gamma \leq v$, if $I' \neq \emptyset$. Also, in this case, note that

$q^*(x)$ must vanish at $y_{i_{r-1}+1}, \dots, y_{i_r}$ and $q^*(\alpha_r) > 0$, $q^*(\beta_r) > 0$ both

hold implying that q^* must have either one y_i , $i_{r-1}+1 \leq i \leq i_r$ as a

zero of even order (at least two) or have at least one more simple zero

in (α_r, β_r) . That is, q^* must have at least $i_r - i_{r-1} + 1$ zeros in

(α_r, β_r) . Set

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^{\gamma} (y'_i - x) & , \quad I' \neq \emptyset \\ 1 & , \quad I' = \emptyset . \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Next, we shall construct a sequence of polynomials $\{\theta_1^N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$

corresponding to each interval (α_i, β_i) , $i = 1, \dots, v$. First, set

$$\omega_j = f(y_j) / \left(N \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} (y_j - y_i) \prod_{i=j+1}^{\mu} (y_i - y_j) |v(y_j)| \right) \quad (3)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, \mu$ where $\prod_{i=1}^0 = \prod_{i=\mu+1}^{\mu} = 1$ and note that $\omega_j \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us first consider the interval (α_1, β_1) where $(\alpha_1, \beta_1) \cap I = \{y_1, \dots, y_{i_1}\}$, $1 \leq i_1 \leq \mu$. The precise form of ϕ_1^N will depend upon the structure of (α_1, β_1) although, in all cases, the polynomials ϕ_1^N will have certain essential properties. Therefore, we must consider cases.

Case 1. $\alpha_1 = a$, $i_1 = 2m + 1$, $m \geq 0$. Note that in this case we must have $\beta_1 < b$ since $\text{card}(X) \geq n + 2$. Furthermore, this interval gives no contribution to I' . Set

$$\phi_1^N(x) = - \prod_{j=0}^m [(y_{2j+1} - \omega_{2j+1}) - x] \prod_{j=1}^m [(y_{2j} + \omega_{2j}) - x] \text{ where } \omega_j \text{ is}$$

defined by (3). Now, since $\omega_j \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ for all j and

$a = \alpha_1 < y_1 < \dots < y_{i_1} < \beta_1$, we can select an N_1 such that $N \geq N_1$

implies that

$$a < y_1 - \omega_1 < y_1 < y_2 < y_2 + \omega_2 < \dots < y_{i_1-1} < y_{i_1-1} + \omega_{i_1-1} < y_{i_1} - \omega_{i_1} < y_{i_1}.$$

Thus, for $N \geq N_1$, we have that $\phi_1^N(x)$ is positive at y_1, \dots, y_{i_1} , and

$\phi_1^N(x) > 0$ for $x \geq \beta_1$ (which implies that $\phi_1^N(x) > 0$ for all $x \in X$).

Let $\rho(s)$ denote the number of zeros of $q^*(x)$ in the interval

(α_s, β_s) , $s = 1, \dots, \nu$ where we count a zero of order p as p zeros.

Then we have $\partial \phi_1^N \leq \rho(1)$ in (α_1, β_1) . Also, setting $\epsilon_1 = y_1 - \omega_1$ for

i odd and $\epsilon_1 = y_1 + \omega_1$ for i even and noting that $\epsilon_1 \rightarrow y_1$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$,

we have, for $1 \leq i \leq i_1$, that

$$1/N \phi_1^N(y_i) = 1/N (-1)^{i+1} \omega_i \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} (\epsilon_j - y_i) \prod_{j=i+1}^{i_1} (\epsilon_j - y_i)$$

$$= \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} (y_i - y_j) \prod_{j=i+1}^{\mu} (y_j - y_i) |v(y_i)|}{f(y_i) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} (y_i - \epsilon_j) \prod_{j=i+1}^{i_1} (\epsilon_j - y_i)}.$$

Now, using (2) and (3), we have

$$1/N \phi_1^N(y_i) \rightarrow f(y_i)^{-1} \prod_{j=i_1+1}^{\mu} (y_j - y_i) \prod_{j=1}^{\gamma} (y'_j - y_i) \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad 1 \leq i \leq i_1.$$

Also, for $x \in X$ satisfying $x > y_{i_1}$, we have (since i_1 is assumed

$$\text{odd}) \text{ that } \phi_1^N(x) = - \prod_{j=1}^{i_1} (\epsilon_j - x) = \prod_{j=1}^{i_1} (x - \epsilon_j) \rightarrow \prod_{j=1}^{i_1} (x - y_j) \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Case 2. $\alpha_1 = a$, $i_1 = 2m$, $m \geq 1$. Once again we have $\beta_1 < b$ and $(\alpha_1, \beta_1) \cap I' = \emptyset$. Set

$$\phi_1^N(x) = \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} [(y_{2j+1} + \omega_{2j+1}) - x] \prod_{j=1}^m [(y_{2j} - \omega_{2j}) - x]. \text{ Again it follows}$$

that we can select an N_1 such that $N \geq N_1$ implies that $\phi_1^N(y_i) > 0$, $1 \leq i \leq i_1$, $\phi_1^N(x) > 0$ for $x \geq \beta_1$ (which implies that $\phi_1^N(x) > 0$ for all $x \in X$) and $\partial \phi_1^N \leq \rho(1)$. Setting $\eta_i = y_i + \omega_i$ for i odd and $\eta_i = y_i - \omega_i$ for i even, we have for y_i , $1 \leq i \leq i_1$, that

$1/N\phi_1^N(y_1) = 1/N(-1)^{i_1-1} \omega_{i_1} \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i_1}}^{i_1} (\eta_j - y_1)$. Again, using (2) and (3) we have

(since i_1 is even) that $1/N\phi_1^N(y_1) \rightarrow f(y_1)^{-1} \prod_{j=i_1+1}^{\mu} (y_j - y_1) \prod_{j=1}^{\gamma} (y'_j - y_1)$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Also, for $x \in X$ with $x > y_{i_1}$, we have that

$$\phi_1^N(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{i_1} (\eta_j - x) = \prod_{j=1}^{i_1} (x - \eta_j) \rightarrow \prod_{j=1}^{i_1} (x - y_j) \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty. \text{ Note that}$$

ϕ_1^N has the same limit, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, for each of these two cases.

Next we consider the case where $\alpha_1 > a$. In this case, the contribution of ϕ_1^N is identical with that of ϕ_r^N for (α_r, β_r) , $r = 2, \dots, v$.

Thus, we consider the construction of ϕ_r^N for (α_r, β_r) where

$r = 1, \dots, v$. Here we must consider an additional four cases. For

convenience set $\ell = i_{r-1}$ and $k = i_r - i_{r-1}$ so that

$$(\alpha_r, \beta_r) \cap I = \{y_{i_{r-1}+1}, \dots, y_{i_r}\} = \{y_{\ell+1}, \dots, y_{\ell+k}\}.$$

Case 3. $\alpha_r > a$, $\beta_r < b$, $r = 1, \dots, v$; $k = 2m + 1$, $m \geq 0$. Note that

in this case $y'_{i_r} \equiv y'_{\ell+k} \in I'$ and $\rho(r) \geq 2m + 2$. Set

$$\phi_r^N(x) = (y'_{\ell+k} - x) \prod_{j=0}^m [(y_{\ell+2j+1} + \omega_{\ell+2j+1}) - x] \prod_{j=1}^m [(y_{\ell+2j} - \omega_{\ell+2j}) - x]. \quad (4)$$

Once again, there exists an N_r such that for $N \geq N_r$ we have

- i) $\phi_r^N(x) > 0, \quad x \leq \alpha_r$
- ii) $\phi_r^N(y_i) > 0, \quad i = \ell + 1, \dots, \ell + k$
- iii) $\phi_r^N(x) > 0, \quad x \geq \beta_r.$

(Note that iii) follows from the even number of linear factors in (4), all of which are negative). Therefore, $\phi_r^N(x) > 0$ for all $x \in X$.

Setting $\rho_i = y_{\ell+i} + \omega_{\ell+i}$ for i odd and $\rho_i = y_{\ell+i} - \omega_{\ell+i}$ for i even, we have for $x \leq \alpha_r$

$$\phi_r^N(x) = \prod_{i=1}^k (\rho_i - x)(y'_{\ell+k} - x) \rightarrow \prod_{j=i_{r-1}+1}^{i_r} (y_j - x)(y'_{i_r} - x) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Similarly for $x \geq \beta_r$ (since k is odd)

$$\phi_r^N(x) = \prod_{i=1}^k (\rho_i - x)(y'_{\ell+k} - x) \rightarrow \prod_{j=i_{r-1}+1}^{i_r} (x - y_j)(x - y'_{i_r}) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Finally, for $y_i, \quad i_{r-1} + 1 \leq i \leq i_r$, we have, using (2) and (3)

(assuming $y'_{i_r} = y'_\theta$ for some $\theta, \quad 1 \leq \theta \leq r$),

$$\begin{aligned} 1/N \phi_r^N(y_i) &= 1/N(-1)^{i-i_{r-1}+1} \omega_i \prod_{j=1}^{i-i_{r-1}-1} (\rho_j - y_i) \prod_{j=i-i_{r-1}+1}^{i_r} (\rho_j - y_i)(y'_{i_r} - y_i) \\ &= \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} (y_i - y_j) \prod_{j=i+1}^{\mu} (y_j - y_i) \left| \prod_{j=1}^{\gamma} (y'_j - y_i) \right|}{f(y_i) \prod_{j=1}^{i-i_r-1} (y_i - \rho_j) \prod_{j=i-i_{r-1}+1}^{i_r} (\rho_j - y_i)(y'_\theta - y_i)} \rightarrow \end{aligned}$$

$$\rightarrow f(y_1)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{i_r-1} (y_i - y_j) \prod_{j=i_r+1}^{\mu} (y_j - y_1) \prod_{j=1}^{\theta-1} (y'_\theta - y_j) \prod_{j=\theta+1}^{\gamma} (y'_j - y'_\theta)$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Case 4. $\alpha_r > a$, $\beta_r < b$, $k = 2m$, $m \geq 1$. Note that in this case

(α_r, β_r) gives no contribution to I' . Set

$$\phi_r^N(x) = \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} [(y_{\ell+2j+1} + \omega_{\ell+2j+1}) - x] \prod_{j=1}^m [(y_{\ell+2j} - \omega_{\ell+2j}) - x].$$

As before, there exists an N_r such that $N \geq N_r$ implies $\phi_r^N(x) > 0$

for all $x \in X$. Using ρ_i as defined in Case 3, we have, for $x \leq \alpha_r$

$$\phi_r^N(x) = \prod_{j=1}^k (\rho_j - x) \rightarrow \prod_{j=i_{r-1}+1}^{i_r} (y_j - x) \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \text{ and for } x \geq \beta_r$$

$$\phi_r^N(x) = \prod_{j=1}^k (\rho_j - x) \rightarrow \prod_{j=i_{r-1}+1}^{i_r} (x - y_j) \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty. \text{ Finally, for } y_i,$$

$i_{r-1} + 1 \leq i \leq i_r$, we have, using (2) and (3).

$$1/N \phi_r^N(x) = 1/N(-1)^{i-i_{r-1}+1} \omega_1^{i-i_{r-1}-1} \prod_{j=1}^{i-i_{r-1}-1} (\rho_j - y_1) \prod_{j=i-i_{r-1}+1}^k (\rho_j - y_1)$$

$$= \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} (y_i - y_j) \prod_{j=i+1}^{\mu} (y_j - y_1) \prod_{j=1}^{\gamma} |y'_j - y_1|}{f(y_1) \prod_{j=1}^{i-i_{r-1}-1} (y_i - \rho_j) \prod_{j=i-i_{r-1}+1}^k (\rho_j - y_1)} \rightarrow$$

$$\rightarrow f(y_i)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{i_{r-1}} (y_i - y_j) \prod_{j=i_r+1}^{\mu} (y_j - y_i) \prod_{j=1}^{\gamma} |y'_j - y_i| \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Case 5. $\alpha_r > a$, $\beta_r = b$, $i_r - i_{r-1} = k = 2m + 1$, $m \geq 0$. Note that in this case $r = v$, $i_v = \mu$ and (α_v, β_v) gives no contribution to I' .

$$\text{Set } \phi_v^N(x) = \prod_{j=0}^m [(y_{\ell+2j+1} + \omega_{\ell+2j+1}) - x] \prod_{j=1}^m [(y_{\ell+2j} - \omega_{\ell+2j}) - x] \text{ where}$$

ω_i is defined by (3). As before, there exists an N_r such that $N \geq N_r$ implies $\phi_v^N(x) > 0$ for all $x \in X$. Using ρ_i as defined in Case 3, we

$$\text{have for } x \leq \alpha_v, \phi_v^N(x) = \prod_{i=1}^k (\rho_i - x) \rightarrow \prod_{i=i_{v-1}+1}^{\mu} (y_i - x) \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Also, for y_i , $i_{r-1} + 1 \leq i \leq \mu$

$$1/N \phi_v^N(y_i) = 1/N(-1)^{i-i_{v-1}+1} \omega_i \prod_{j=1}^k (\rho_j - y_i) \rightarrow f(y_i)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{i_{v-1}} (y_i - y_j) \prod_{j=1}^{\gamma} |y'_j - y_i|$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$ using the same argument as before.

Case 6. $\alpha_r > a$, $\beta_r = b$, $(r = v, i_r = \mu)$, $\mu - i_{r-1} = k = 2m$, $m \geq 1$.

Again, the interval (α_v, β_v) gives no contribution to I' . Set

$$\phi_v^N(x) = \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} [(y_{\ell+2j+1} + \omega_{\ell+2j+1}) - x] \prod_{j=1}^m [(y_{\ell+2j} - \omega_{\ell+2j}) - x]. \text{ As before,}$$

$$\text{we have } \phi_v^N(x) > 0 \text{ for all } x \in X. \phi_v^N(x) \rightarrow \prod_{j=i_{v-1}+1}^{\mu} (y_j - x) \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

for $x \leq \alpha_v$. For y_1 , $i_{v-1} + 1 \leq i \leq \mu$,

$$1/N \phi_v^N(y_1) \rightarrow f(y_1)^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{i_{v-1}} (y_1 - y_j) \prod_{j=1}^Y |y'_j - y_1|. \quad \text{Recalling that } \rho(s) \text{ is}$$

the number of zeros of $q^*(x)$ in the interval (α_s, β_s) , $s = 1, \dots, v$,

we observe that in Cases 4, 5 and 6, $\partial \phi_r^N(x) \leq \rho(r)$. Therefore, we set

$$p_N(x) = \prod_{s=1}^v \phi_s^N(x), \quad \text{where } \phi_s^N(x) \text{ is constructed with respect to the}$$

interval (α_s, β_s) , $s = 1, \dots, v$ as described above (depending upon

(α_s, β_s)). Since $\partial \phi_s^N(s) \leq \rho(s)$, these intervals (by construction) are

pairwise disjoint and $\|q^*\|_X = 1$, we have that $\partial p_N \leq \partial q^*$. Also,

there exists an N such that $N \geq N^*$ implies that $\phi_s^N(x) > 0$ for all

$x \in X$, $s = 1, \dots, v$ so that $p_N \in (k)$ for $N \geq N^*$. Furthermore, for

$x \in X \sim I$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N p_N(x)} = \left(\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \right) \prod_{s=1}^v \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\phi_s^N(x)}$$

$$= \left(\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \right) \left(\prod_{i=1}^{\mu} |y_i - x| \prod_{i=1}^Y |y'_i - x| \right)^{-1} = 0 \quad \text{since the}$$

quantity in parentheses on the right is not equal to zero. Also, since

$I \cup I' \rightarrow \text{dist}(\emptyset, X \sim I) = c > 0$, we have that the above convergence is uniform in

$X \sim I$. Finally, for $y_1 \in I$ (say $y_1 \in (\alpha_r, \beta_r)$) we have that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N p_N(y_1)} = \left(\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{s=1}^v \frac{1}{\theta_s^N(y_1)} \right) \left(\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N \theta_r^N(y_1)} \right) = f(y_1)^{-1}. \text{ Thus, by}$$

selecting $N \geq N^*$ sufficiently large so that $\left| \frac{1}{f(y_1)} - \frac{1}{N p_N(y_1)} \right| < \Delta$,

$i = 1, \dots, \mu$ and $\left| \frac{1}{N p_N(x)} \right| < \Delta$ holds for all $x \in X \sim I$ we have that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{f} - \frac{1}{N p_N} \right\|_X < \Delta \quad (\text{recall that } \left| \frac{1}{f(x)} \right| \leq \Delta \text{ on } X \sim I), \text{ which is our}$$

desired contradiction. Hence, we must have $c^* > 0$. Thus, $q^*(x) > 0$

for all $x \in X$. Furthermore, $\frac{c_v}{q_v} \rightarrow \frac{c^*}{q^*}$ uniformly in X as $v \rightarrow \infty$ so

$$\text{that } \left\| \frac{1}{f} - \frac{c^*}{q^*} \right\| = \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{f} - \frac{c_v}{q_v} \right\| = \Delta. \text{ This, in turn implies that}$$

$p^* = q^*/c^*$ is our desired best approximation from K .

Finally, we would like to close this section with results on characterization and uniqueness. Using the standard argument [17] for alternation of best rational approximants on an interval we have:

THEOREM 2. Let $f \in C(X)$ where X is a compact subset of the real line. Let $n \geq 0$ be a given integer and set

$$R_n^0(X) = \{1/p(x) : p \in \Pi_n, p(x) > 0, \text{ for all } x \in X\}. \text{ Assume } 1/f \notin R_n^0(X).$$

Then a necessary and sufficient condition that $1/p^*$ is a best approximation to $1/f$ on X from $R_n^0(X)$ is that the error curve

$$e^*(1/f) = 1/f - 1/p^* \text{ alternate at least } n+1 \text{ times.}$$

It should be remarked that this theorem is also valid for $R_n^m(X)$
 $= \{r = p/q: p \in \Pi_m, q \in \Pi_n, q > 0 \text{ on } X \text{ and } \|q\| = 1\}$, ~~where the restriction~~
 ~~R_n^m is not needed from Π_m For Theorem 2 the restriction that Π_m is~~
~~not all R_n^m is necessary.~~

On the question of uniqueness, we can simply quote the results we
 desire from work of Cheney and Loeb [6, 13]. Indeed, they actually
 prove that whenever existence holds for $R_n^m(X)$ then so does uniqueness
 and strong uniqueness.

THEOREM 3. [16, p. 94-95]. Let $f \in C(X)$ satisfy $f(x) > 0$ for
all $x \in X$. Then there exists a unique best approximation $1/p^*$ to $1/f$
from $R_n^0(X)$. Furthermore, there exists a positive constant $\gamma = \gamma(f)$
 such that for each $1/p \in R_n^0(X)$ (strong uniqueness)

$$\left\| \frac{1}{f} - \frac{1}{p} \right\| \geq \left\| \frac{1}{f} - \frac{1}{p^*} \right\| + \gamma \left\| \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p^*} \right\|.$$

3. COMPUTATION

In this section, we wish to describe three possible algorithms for computing best approximations to $1/f$, $f(x) > 0$ for all $x \in X$, from $R_n^0(X)$. The algorithms are Remes, differential correction and a hybrid algorithm which is a combination of the first two. In a future paper we shall report on numerical experiments involving these algorithms. In what follows, we shall assume X is a finite set.

Remes algorithm has been widely studied and appears often in the literature. Two explicit papers where the Remes algorithm is proposed for calculating best rational approximations are in Cody, Fraser and Hart [7], and Ralston [15]. The Remes algorithm consists of two main operations:

- 1) the solution of a nonlinear system
- and 1i) the exchange of a certain set of points.

It is known that in general the nonlinear system may have many solutions (and sometimes none of which belong to $R_n^0(X)$) [16, p. 104], [9]. Thus Remes could fail to run due to its inability to either solve this system or by returning a solution to this system which is not in the class $R_n^0(X)$. (A second problem with Remes algorithm will be mentioned later.) Even if the algorithm is able to solve this system at each step with a solution in $R_n^0(X)$, convergence can only be guaranteed if the algorithm was initialized with a sufficiently "good" starting approximation (for the case X is an interval). In a recent study by Lee and Roberts [12], it is observed that the Remes algorithm is very fast when it converges, but may fail to converge. Also, observe that in the theory

we are considering here every function being approximated is normal in the usual sense.

The differential correction algorithm was originally introduced by Cheney and Loeb [5]. This algorithm was shown to have very desirable convergence properties by Barrodale, Powell and Roberts in [1] and a Fortran listing of it can be found in [11]. In the setting considered here this particular algorithm possesses guaranteed (quadratic) convergence to the desired best approximation in $R_n^0(X)$. However, in practice, if X is large it is sometimes necessary to solve this problem on a subset of X and then initialize the full problem with this solution. This is due to the fact that this method involves a linear programming subroutine which is sometimes numerically difficult to solve without a good initialization. Also, due to the inclusion of this linear programming subroutine, this algorithm is quite slow (some 19 times slower than Remes (when Remes converges) in tests done in [12]).

The final algorithm that we wish to mention for this problem is a hybrid of the above two. Precisely, we propose to replace the step of the Remes algorithm where a nonlinear system is solved to get a best approximation on a reference set (smaller than X) with the differential correction algorithm applied to this reference set to give the desired best approximation on this set. This method will eliminate the problems of the Remes algorithm associated with the solution of the nonlinear system in that a best approximation on the reference set (which is positive on the reference set) will be found. However, there is still no guarantee that the best approximation on a given reference set found

by the differential correction algorithm will actually belong to $R_n^0(X)$ (i.e., it may fail to be positive (or defined) on some points of X not in the reference set). In fact, we have encountered such examples in testing our hybrid algorithm and these examples have given rise to a second problem in the Remes algorithm. Namely, the exchange procedure cycled.

Thus, it is also necessary to modify the exchange procedure. At present we are testing two modified algorithms. In order to describe these modifications, let us assume that we are at the k -th step of the iteration and suppose that the best approximation r_k on the reference set X_k ($n + 2$ points from X) has been found by the differential correction algorithm.

The first modified exchange algorithm is as follows. Perform a multiple exchange in the usual manner only among those points of X where $r_k(x) > 0$ holds. If r_k is not the best approximation on the set of points where it is positive then a new reference set is obtained and the algorithm proceeds to the differential correction phase to find the best approximation on this new reference set. If r_k is the best approximation on the set of points where it is positive then terminate the algorithm if $r_k(x) > 0$ for all $x \in X$ (r_k is the desired best approximation on X) or adjoin to the set X_k , $y \in X$ where $r_k(y) = \min\{r_k(x) : x \in X\}$. Note that $r_k(y) \leq 0$ must hold in this case. Set $X'_{k+1} = \{y\} \cup X_k$ and apply the differential correction algorithm to this set of $n + 3$ points finding the best approximation r_{k+1} on it. Next, reduce X'_{k+1} to a subset of $n + 2$ points, X_{k+1} , where X_{k+1} is chosen so that alternation holds on X_{k+1} . Now repeat the exchange procedure on X_{k+1} with respect to r_{k+1} .

The second modified exchange algorithm is basically a reordering of the above one. In particular, if r_k the best approximation on X_k is positive on all of X then we proceed with a multiple exchange in the usual manner. If r_k is not

positive on all of X then we adjoin $y \in X$ to X_k precisely as above, getting X'_{k+1} and proceed as in the above algorithm.

One can prove that in both of these modified algorithms, cycling cannot occur and that global convergence holds for X finite (i.e., error of approximation on successive reference sets strictly increases). In a future paper we shall give a detailed description of these two algorithms and report on the results of our numerical testing of them. Also, we are studying the extension of these ideas to $R_n^m(X)$ and will also report on this at that time.

Acknowledgement:

Acknowledge: The second author wishes to acknowledge a valuable personal conversation with Professor Dietrich Braess with regard to this problem.

1. I. Barrodale, M. J. D. Powell and F. D. K. Roberts, The differential correction algorithm for rational ℓ_∞ approximation, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 9 (1972), 493-504.
2. H.-P. Blatt, Rationale Tschebyscheff-Approximation über Unbeschränkten Intervallen, Habilitationsschrift, der Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1974.
3. H.-P. Blatt, Rationale Approximation auf $[0, \infty)$, ZAMM 53 (1973), 181-182.
4. D. Brink and G. D. Taylor, Chebyshev approximation by reciprocals of polynomials on $[0, \infty)$, J. Approx. Theory (to appear).
5. E. W. Cheney and H. L. Loeb, Two new algorithms for rational approximation, Numer. Math. 3 (1961), 72-75.
6. E. W. Cheney and H. L. Loeb, Generalized rational approximation, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., Ser. B, 1 (1964), 11-25.
7. W. J. Cody, W. Fraser and J. F. Hart, Rational Chebyshev approximation using linear equations, Numer. Math. 12 (1968), 242-251.
8. C. B. Dunham, Chebyshev approximation by interpolating rationals on $[0, \infty)$, Math. Comp., 29 (1975), 549-551.
9. C. B. Dunham, Convergence of the Fraser-Hart algorithm for rational Chebyshev approximation. Preprint.
10. D. R. Gimlin, R. K. Cavin III and M. C. Budge, Jr., A multiple exchange algorithm for best restricted approximations, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 11 (1974), 219-231.
11. E. H. Kaufman, Jr. and G. D. Taylor, Uniform rational approximation of functions of several variables, Int. J. Numer. Math. in Eng. 9 (1975), 297-323.
12. C. M. Lee and F. D. K. Roberts, A comparison of algorithms for rational ℓ_∞ approximation, Math. Comp. 27 (1973), 111-121.
13. H. L. Loeb, Approximation by generalized rationals, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 3 (1966), 34-55.
14. G. Meinardus, A. R. Reddy, G. D. Taylor and R. S. Varga, Converse theorems and extensions in Chebyshev rational approximation to certain entire functions in $[0, \infty)$, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 170 (1972), 171-185.

15. A. Ralston, Rational Chebyshev approximation, in "Mathematical methods for digital computers" Vol. 2 (A. Ralston and H. S. Wilf, Eds.), pp. 264-284, Wiley, New York, 1967.
16. J. R. Rice, The Approximation of Functions. Vol.2: Nonlinear and Multivariate Theory, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1969.
17. T. J. Rivlin, An Introduction to the Approximation of Functions, Blaisdell, Waltham, Mass., 1969.
18. E. B. Saff, A. Schonage and R. S. Varga, Geometric convergence to e^{-z} by rational functions with real poles. Preprint.
19. G. D. Taylor and M. J. Winter, Calculation of best restricted approximations, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 7 (1970), 248-255.